

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-16 were presented for examination and are pending in this application. In an Official Office Action dated February 15, 2007, claims 1-16 were rejected. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for her consideration and thoughtful analysis. The Applicant addresses the Examiner's comments concerning the claims pending in this application below.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 15 and 16 and respectfully traverses the Examiner's prior rejections. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11-14 are cancelled without prejudice and no new claims are presently added. The additional limitations brought into the independent claims place the claims in better condition for consideration on appeal and because these additional limitations appear in dependent claims as filed, these amendments are not believed to raise any new issues that would require further research by the Examiner. Accordingly, the amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. 1.116. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution and issuance of the application. In making these amendments, the Applicant has not and is not narrowing the scope of the protection to which the Applicant considers the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede, directly or by implication, that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### **Interview Summary**

A telephonic interview was conducted on March 20, 2007 at approximately 1:00 EST between Michael Martensen for the Applicant and Examiner Ha. Art cited against claims 1 and 10 were discussed as was a proposed amendment incorporating many of the dependent claims. An agreement was reached with respect to the scope of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,319 by Britt et al. ("Britt"). An agreement was not reached with respect to the scope of Britt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,690 by Howard et al. ("Howard"). Examiner Ha suggested examining automatic redirection as an added limitation as well as reviewing the specification for support of revalidation of the configuration data that would support the reestablishment of communications.

### **Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 10-11 and 13-16 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Britt. Applicant continues to respectfully traverse these rejections. Claims 4-9, 12 and 14 were rejected under 25 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britt in view of Howard.

The Applicant amends claims 1 and 10 to incorporate limitations of dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11-14 rendering the anticipation rejection by Britt moot.


The Final Office Action of February 15, 2007 addresses the arguments forwarded by the Applicant by arguing, in essence, that the detection of an error condition in Britt in combination with Howard is synonymous to detecting and correcting a communication error as claimed by the applicant.

The Applicant disagrees. By differentiating a communication error associated with an identity problem as opposed to a connectivity problem, the

present invention enables the customer to organize how a remote services system is deployed and maintained. For example, a communication error comprising an error and the identity of a component is dealt with automatically by an server local to the customer while connectivity errors may be automatically dealt with by either a local server or one controlled by the service provider. Britt in view of Howard fails to address these distinctions.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

 , 2007

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael C. Martensen, Reg. No. 46,901  
Hogan & Hartson LLP  
One Tabor Center  
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
(719) 448-5910 Tel  
(303) 899-7333 Fax